

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The two attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 16 and 26. The replacement sheet including Figure 16 replaces the original sheet including Figure 16. The replacement sheet including Figure 26 replaces the original sheet including Figure 26. In Figure 16, reference characters 1603 and 1605 have been removed. In Figure 26, reference characters 2650 and 2660 have been added. Figure 26 has also been rotated.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed April 4, 2007. Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 9, 11-22, 24, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the application.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for including reference characters not mentioned in the description. In particular, the Office Action notes that Figure 1 (reference characters 129, 131, and 133), Figure 3 (reference character 309), Figure 15 (reference character 1501), and Figure 16 (reference characters 1603 and 1605) included reference characters not mentioned in the description. Applicant has amended the specification to include the reference characters 129, 131, 133, 309, and 1501. Applicant has amended the drawings to delete the reference characters 1603 and 1605 in Figure 16.

Additionally, the drawings are objected to for lacking reference characters for features shown in Figure 26 and discussed in the specification. Applicant has amended Figure 26 to add reference characters 2650 (referring to the “dialog box”) and 2660 (referring to the “results screen”).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to for including acronyms without first including a description in plain text. Applicant has amended the specification to provide plain-text descriptions for the acronyms I/O, XML, API, CPU, PCI, USB, BIOS, NAS, SAN, PXE, HTTP, SOAP, MPI, TCP/IP, UDP, DAV, and IT. No new matter is believed to have been added.

The specification is also objected to for an ambiguous reference to "interface logic 303" in Figure 3. Applicant has amended the specification to replace the phrase "interface logic 303" with the phrase "human interface logic 303."

Additionally, the specification is also objected to for discussing features shown in Figure 26 without providing reference numbers for the features. Applicant has amended the specification to include references to reference characters 2650 (referring to the "dialog box") and 2660 (referring to the "results screen") added to Figure 26.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 11-20 to recite, in pertinent part, a "computer-readable storage medium." Support for the amendments to claims 11-20 may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 63, lines 1-6. Claims 11-20 (as amended) are believed to be limited to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-20 under § 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-23, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bird, et al. (EP 1,043,671, hereinafter "Bird"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under § 102(b) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481,

485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Bird fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bird does not teach or suggest a method comprising “generating a message in response to the user input [to request performance of a task], wherein the message comprises one or more instructions which are computer-executable to perform the task” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. Bird discloses performing numerous types of tasks in a publish/subscribe service with the processing of messages at a message broker. For example, Bird discloses that the capabilities of a subscriber system are determined when the subscriber system registers with a broker (see, e.g., paragraph 14), and message content is then processed by the broker to conform to the subscriber’s capabilities (see, e.g., paragraph 15). Nevertheless, Applicant believes that the only tasks that are disclosed by Bird to be performed in response to user input involve the initial registration of the subscriber system with the broker (see, e.g., paragraphs 14 and 39). The remaining tasks appear to be performed automatically, i.e., not in response to user input. Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Bird for entering user input to request performance of any of the subsequent tasks, i.e., the tasks relating to the processing of messages at the broker and the distribution of the messages to subscriber systems.

However, regarding the limitation “wherein the message comprises one or more instructions which are computer-executable to perform the task,” the Office Action cites Bird’s generation of a message including HTML or XML program code describing the format of data for display by a web browser (see, e.g., paragraph 46). This message including HTML or XML program code is a message that is passed from the broker to subscriber systems, not a message generated at the subscriber system in response to user input (i.e., a message related to the registration of a subscriber system). Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Bird that any message generated in response to user

input to request performance a task comprises one or more instructions which are computer-executable to perform the task.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Bird does not teach or suggest a method comprising “storing the message in a message log” and “retrieving the portable message from the message log” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. Although Bird discloses that a message including system capability information is sent to the broker (see, e.g., paragraphs 14 and 41), there is no teaching or suggestion that this message is stored in a message log, nor that the portable message is retrieved from the message log. Similarly, although Bird discloses that messages (e.g., including multimedia content) are sent from the broker to subscribers, there is no teaching or suggestion that these messages are stored in a message log, nor that the portable messages are retrieved from the message log.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Bird does not teach or suggest a method comprising “executing the one or more instructions to perform the task again on one or more additional computer systems” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. Again, Bird discloses performing numerous types of tasks, but the only tasks performed in response to user input are associated with the initial registration of the subscriber system. As discussed above, Bird’s registration request does not result in the generation of a message comprising one or more instructions which are computer-executable to perform the task, and thus Bird’s subscriber registration does not generate a message comprising instructions which are executed to perform the task again on one or more additional computer systems. Therefore, Bird does not teach or suggest that a task is performed again on one or more additional computer systems after user input is entered to a source application on a first computer system to request performance of the task.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentably distinct from Bird. Examples of dependent claims reciting further distinctions over the cited art are discussed below.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Bird does not teach or suggest a method comprising “performing the task on the first computer system in response to the user input” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. In particular, Applicant can find no task in Bird that is performed both on a first computer system and on one or more additional computer systems. For example, the determination of the subscriber system’s capabilities is performed only on the subscriber system, and the modification of multimedia content is performed only on the broker. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2, 12, and 22 are patentably distinct from Bird.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Bird does not teach or suggest a method comprising “sorting the message log by one or more elements of the metadata” in combination with the remaining features of claims 1 and 5. In rejecting claim 9, the Office Action cites paragraph 3 of Bird, in which Bird discloses the registration of subscriber interests by keyword, the use of a message dictionary describing the structure of messages, and the querying of messages for keywords. However, Bird does not teach or suggest sorting the message log by one or more elements of the metadata. Furthermore, Bird does not teach or suggest sorting the message log by one or more elements of the metadata which comprise identifying characteristics of the source application. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 9, 19, and 29 are patentably distinct from Bird.

Applicant asserts that numerous others of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-7, 14-17, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird in view of Pabla, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,127,613, hereinafter “Pabla”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 4-7, 14-17, and 24-27 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-11900/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

☒ Replacement Figures 16 and 26 on two sheets

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/

Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2007-08-06 JCH/RPH